

EXHIBIT L

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 9:14 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online

Hi [REDACTED]

Okay, back to the articles.

So, again the article scores is based on the number of times the screen terms appears in the article together with the date of the article. It is this combination that ultimately determines the scores.

The following is a more technical explanation of the scoring from the Adverse media guide (attached for reference):

Scoring: Each article returned via Adverse Media has a score attached to it. The score is based on a series of factors, detailed below:

** The score is a % of the max score from the search, so the first score is always 100% where it's absolute score is a floating point number greater than 0.*

** The article is reciprocally aged, so at 2 years old its absolute score is 50% of its original score.*

** The absolute score is computed by TF/IDF by Solr, that is frequency of the term in the document multiple by its inverse frequency in the full set of documents.*

In very basic terms, this score is based on the date of the article (ie: an article with a more recent date would have a higher score) and the number of times the name appears in the article (ie: an article where the name appears 20 times would score

I screened all three names at a minimum score threshold of "0" on my test group. As of today:

Patokh Chodiev – 98 total articles

ENRC article scores at 35

The scores depend on how often the name appears in comparison with other articles where the name may be mentioned more times as well as the date of the article. Because all of the pools of articles (dates, name occurrence, etc) differ from name to name, the scores for any given article vary.

Please let me know if that helps to clarify further

Best

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2019 10:56
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online

[REDACTED]

Ok, so with this logic, if the number of other articles with higher scoring appears for this individual this is less likely that our article would appear with the high score.

But here it is the other way around in the attached screenings – for [REDACTED] there are 10 articles each with a fairly high score, for [REDACTED] and Patokh Chodiev there are only 2 and 4 – so my understanding is the articles in question should appear for them as well with even higher score than for [REDACTED].

Also when you consider screening [REDACTED] the both articles scored 100 and 99 respectively also mention him only once, so how come the difference in the score is so high?

I do not follow how the logic of scoring was applied here and it will be really hard to explain it further to [REDACTED]. Anyways, is it somehow possible to change the scoring for the article manually on request to make it appear in the screening?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 2:42 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online

Hello [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

As [REDACTED] mentioned in a previous email, the score of the article is based on two factors – the date of the article and the number of times the name screened appears in the article *relative to other articles in the same pool (i.e. other articles that also mention the name screened)*.

To give you an example, let's say that I am screening "[REDACTED]" and "[REDACTED]". There is an Article X where both appear mentioned.

When I screen "[REDACTED]" there are a thousand other articles that mention the name "[REDACTED]" so Article X is being scored *in relation* to those thousand other articles. Because "[REDACTED]" is mentioned only once in Article X and is mentioned multiple times in the other articles, Article X has a much lower score in relation to the other articles where he is mentioned multiple times (the date of the article being the same).

Meanwhile, [REDACTED] only appears in 3 articles within the pool. [REDACTED] is mentioned twice in Article X and only once in the other two articles. Article X then has a much higher score for [REDACTED] (in comparison to the score for the same article in relation to [REDACTED]).

Please let me know if that helps to clarify or if you have any additional questions!

Kindest Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 January 2019 06:13
To: GRC - WC - Support
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online

Hi,

I still do not understand how the articles that are identical can have such a different scoring. Please see attached details of the screening from today. Still the articles appear only for [REDACTED].

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2019 10:21 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online [ref:_00D3 []

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you so much for your input on SOL Scoring yesterday. Aleksandra has come back with further queries regarding the scoring on the articles for the 3 individuals:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Patokh Chodiev

Is there a way I can check this?

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24-01-2019 6:09
To: grc.wc.support@thomsonreuters.com
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online []

Hi,

Thanks, I do understand how the scoring works, that is why I am surprised that screening for Patokh Chodiev and [REDACTED] although done on the same date did not reveal the same articles. Note that for the articles mentioned the names of those individuals appeared the same amount of times within the article – only once. Shouldn't this mean that the scoring would be the same?

Given that the scoring should be the same the match should have appeared for Patokh Chodiev but it did not. Can you please assist further and explain what was the exact scoring on the articles for each of the three individuals?

Note that we have been queried on this matter by our customer and they are awaiting our response.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2019 9:03 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online []

Hi [REDACTED],

Thank you for your email. I have engaged our Advanced Support team for this query, they reverted with the following:

Adverse Media results are scored based on two factors: the date of the article (the more recent the date, the higher the score) and the number of times the name appears in the article relative to other articles where the name is mentioned (i.e. an article where Patokh Chodiev is mentioned twice will, all things being equal, have a lower score than one where the name is mentioned 20 times).

So here, when screening [REDACTED] and Patokh Chodiev and [REDACTED], even though they are all mentioned in said article, the score for the article for each individual may vary depending on the other articles available that mention each name. For example, if I screen Patokh Chodiev today, the articles in question only score at 35, whereas when I screen [REDACTED], the articles score 89.

Please let me know if you need further assistance.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23-01-2019 12:54
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: SOL Query: Media Articles not matched for two individuals in Screening Online

Hi Team,

We have recently encountered an issue with Media Articles in Screening Online, hopefully you will be able to help us establish what was the reason one article appeared for the screened individual but did not for two others.

[REDACTED]

ENRC wins right of appeal in bid to keep corruption investigation secret
Source: Telegraph Online (UK)
Date: 2017/10/12

ENRC wins right to appeal over SFO order to disclose documents

Source: Daily Telegraph (UK)

Date: 2017/10/12

Both articles contain information about the screened individual [REDACTED] and Patokh Chodiev as well however screening for those names did not reveal any such matches. Can you please explain why this happened? I can see that for [REDACTED] the screening was done on a different date so maybe the scoring threshold was not met? But for Patokh Chodiev the date of the initial screening was the same so the article should appear.

See all links:

https://screening.complinet.com/investigation/name_details/summary_ongoing?guid=100000002241858654

https://screening.complinet.com/investigation/name_details/summary_ongoing?guid=100000002281168418

https://screening.complinet.com/investigation/name_details/summary_ongoing?guid=100000002241975263

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]